



TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

		Application No.	10/705,186
		Filing Date	November 10, 2003
		First Named Inventor	Michael J.G. Gleissner
		Art Unit	3714
		Examiner Name	John Sotomayor
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	27	Attorney Docket Number	6378P002

ENCLOSURES (check all that apply)

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment / Response <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> PTO/SB/08 <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Basic Filing Fee <input type="checkbox"/> Declaration/POA <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to Group <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Group (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):	<input type="checkbox"/> -Return Receipt Postcard (1) <input type="checkbox"/> -Check: \$500 (1)	
			<input type="checkbox"/> Remarks	

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm or Individual name	Thomas M. Coester, Reg. No. 39,637 BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Signature	
Date	July 19, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Typed or printed name	Nadya Gordon		
Signature		Date	July 19, 2005

Based on PTO/SB/21 (04-04) as modified by Blakely, Solokoff, Taylor & Zafman (wlr) 06/04/2004.
SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450



FEES TRANSMITTAL for FY 2005		<i>Complete if Known</i>	
Patent fees are subject to annual revision.		Application Number	10/705,186
<input type="checkbox"/> Applicant claims small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27.		Filing Date	November 10, 2003
TOTAL AMOUNT OF PAYMENT (\$)		First Named Inventor	Michael J.G. Gleissner
500.00		Examiner Name	John Sotomayor
		Art Unit	3714
		Attorney Docket No.	6378P002

METHOD OF PAYMENT (check all that apply)

Check Credit card Money Order None Other (please identify): _____

Deposit Account Deposit Account Number: 02-2666 Deposit Account Name: Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP

For the above-identified deposit account, the Director is hereby authorized to: (check all that apply)

Charge fee(s) indicated below Charge fee(s) indicated below, except for the filing fee

Charge any additional fee(s) or underpayment of fee(s) Credit any overpayments

under 37 CFR §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.18 and 1.20.

FEE CALCULATION
1. EXTRA CLAIM FEES

		Extra Claims	Fee from below	Fee Paid
Total Claims	19	66 ^m	= 0	X 50.00 = \$0.00
Independent Claims	2	21 ^m	= 0	X 200.00 = \$0.00
Multiple Dependent				=

Large Entity **Small Entity**

Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Description
1202	50	2202	25	Claims in excess of 20
1201	200	2201	100	Independent claims in excess of 3
1203	350	2203	180	Multiple Dependent claim, if not paid
1204	300	2204	150	**Reissue independent claims over original patent
1205	300	2205	150	**Reissue claims in excess of 20 and over original patent

***or number previously paid, if greater, For Reissues, see below*

SUBTOTAL (1) (\$ 0.00)

2. ADDITIONAL FEES
Large Entity **Small Entity**

Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Code	Fee (\$)	Fee Description	Fee Paid
1051	130	2051	65	Surcharge - late filing fee or oath	
1052	50	2052	25	Surcharge - late provisional filing fee or cover sheet.	
2053	130	2053	130	Non-English specification	
1251	120	2251	60	Extension for reply within first month	
1252	450	2252	225	Extension for reply within second month	
1253	1,020	2253	510	Extension for reply within third month	
1254	1,590	2254	795	Extension for reply within fourth month	
1255	2,160	2255	1,080	Extension for reply within fifth month	
1401	500	2401	250	Notice of Appeal	
1402	500	2402	250	Filing a brief in support of an appeal	
1403	1,000	2403	500	Request for oral hearing	
1451	1,510	2451	1,510	Petition to institute a public use proceeding	
1460	130	2460	130	Petitions to the Commissioner	
1807	50	1807	50	Processing fee under 37 CFR 1.17(q)	
1806	180	1806	180	Submission of Information Disclosure Stmt	
1809	750	1809	395	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR § 1.129(a))	
1810	750	2810	395	Filing a submission after final rejection (37 CFR § 1.129(b))	

Other fee (specify)

SUBTOTAL (2)

(\$ 500.00)

SUBMITTED BY **Complete (if applicable)**

Name (Print/Type)	Thomas M. Coester	Registration No. (Attorney/Agent)	39,637	Telephone	(310) 207-3800
Signature	<i>Thomas Coester</i>			Date	07/19/05



Docket No.: 006378P002

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Michael J. G. Gleissner, et al.

Application No.: 10/405,186

Filed: November 10, 2003

For: **SYSTEM FOR LEARNING LANGUAGE
THROUGH EMBEDDED CONTENT ON
A SINGLE MEDIUM**

Art Group: 3714

Examiner: John Sotomayor

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Madam:

Applicants, (hereinafter "Appellants") submit one copy of the following Appeal Brief pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.192 for consideration by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. Appellants also submit herewith a check in the amount of \$500.00 to cover the cost of filing the opening brief as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(2). Please charge any additional amount due or credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 02-2666.

07/25/2005 EFLORES 00000118 10705186

01 FC:1402

500.00 0P

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	3
II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES.....	3
III. STATUS OF CLAIMS	3
IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS.....	3
V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....	3
VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL.....	6
VII. ARGUMENT	7
A. Overview of the Prior Art.....	7
1. Overview of Falcon.....	7
2. Overview of Sameth.....	8
3. Overview of Rtischev	8
4. Overview of Kehoe	9
B. Rejection of Claims 51 and 89 Under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as Anticipated by Falcon.....	9
C. Rejection of Claims 52, 54, and 63 Under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as Anticipated by Falcon.....	11
D. Rejection of Claim 53 Under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as Anticipated by Falcon	12
E. Rejection of Claims 59 Under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as Anticipated by Falcon.....	12
F. Rejection of Claims 60 Under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as Anticipated by Falcon.....	12
G. Rejection of Claim 61 Under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as Anticipated by Falcon	13
H. Rejection of Claims 64 Under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as Anticipated by Falcon.....	13
I. Rejection of Claims 65 Under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as Anticipated by Falcon.....	14
J. Rejection of Claims 66 Under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as Anticipated by Falcon.....	14
K. Rejection of Claim 55 Under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as Obvious over Falcon in view of Sameth.	14
L. Rejection of Claims 56, 57, 58, and 62 Under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as Obvious over Falcon in view of Sameth and in view of Kehoe	15
M. Rejection of Claim 67 Under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as Obvious over Falcon in view of Rtischev	16
N. Rejection of Claim 68 Under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as Obvious over Falcon in view of Rtischev	17
VIII. CONCLUSION AND RELIEF	18
IX. CLAIMS APPENDIX	19
X. EVIDENCE APPENDIX	22
XI. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX	22

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

Michael J. G. Gleissner, et al., the party named in the caption, transferred his rights in that which is disclosed in the subject application through an assignment recorded on December 4, 2003 to Bigfoot Productions, Inc. Bigfoot Productions, Inc. assigned its rights in the subject application on May 9, 2004 to Movielearn Systems Ltd., Pte., a Singaporean corporation. Accordingly, Movielearn Systems Ltd., Pte. is the real party in interest.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other appeals or interferences that will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in this Appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 51-68 and 89 are pending in the application, all of which have been rejected. Appellants appeal the rejection of claims 51-68 and 89.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendment has been submitted after the Final Office Action mailed March 22, 2005.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The embodiments of the invention disclose a method and a system for using pre-existing entertainment media such as feature films on DVD or music or CD in connection with additional language-learning content stored in a companion file (Abstract). The system provides enhanced features including language learning, content controls, and an inference engine to adapt the additional content to the needs of a user (Page 3, lines 1-8). Independent claims 51 and 89 and dependent claims (52-68) are presented in this appeal.

Independent claims 51 and 89 recite presenting an original content including at least one of video or audio content originally produced primarily for purposes other than language learning (Abstract); providing assistance to a user to facilitate language learning (Page 3, lines 1-8 and Page 7, lines 22-28); observing an activity of the user (Fig. 8, block 805 and Page 24, lines 13-22); inferring the extent of knowledge of a language of the user (Fig. 8, block 807 and Page 24, lines 22-23); and automatically adjusting the form of assistance to the user (Fig. 8, block 809 and Page 25, lines 1-19).

With respect to claims 52, 54, and 63, these claims incorporate the limitations of claim 51. Claims 52 further includes delivering the original content with an additional content via a same digital medium (Page 3, lines 14-17); wherein the additional content includes a text database of the words present within the original content; and wherein the additional content further includes information about the words (reference number 203 of Fig. 2A and Page 10, lines 16-19). Claims 54 further includes playing the original content associated with a plurality of sequentially adjacent words wherein the length and starting point of the sequence of words is responsive to a user input (Page 9, lines 5-15 and Page 10, lines 28-31). Claim 63 further includes providing additional content that includes an index of words spoken in the original content (reference number 203 of Fig. 5 and Page 19, lines 17-23); providing a library of audible pronunciations for a plurality of the words in the index (Page 20, line 7); and playing the pronunciations in response to a user input (Page 19, line 9).

Claim 53 incorporates the limitations of claim 51 and further includes combining an additional content from a separate digital medium with the original content (server 135 of Fig. 1 and Page 3, lines 14-17); wherein the additional content includes a text database of the words present within the original content; and wherein the additional content further includes information about the words (Page 10, lines 16-19).

Claim 59 incorporates the limitations of claim 51 and further includes automatically pausing the content during playback at a point and for a duration based on the extent of the knowledge (Page 25, lines 1-10).

Claim 60 incorporates the limitations of Claim 59 and further includes automatically offering an additional content during a pause based on the extent of the knowledge (Page 25, line 4).

Claim 61 incorporates the limitations of claim 51 and further includes prompting the user to indicate if they desire more or less assistance (Page 24, line 20).

Claim 64 incorporates the limitations of claim 51 and further includes analyzing at least one of a user input, a context of the user input, a database of the original content, a database of an additional content, and a database of user information to identify information of interest in relation to a segment of the original content; presenting the information of interest prior to playing the segment (Page 14, line 29- Page 15, line 22).

Claim 65 incorporates the limitations of claim 51 and further includes analyzing at least one of a user input, a context of the user input, a database of the original content, a database of an additional content, and a database of user information to identify information of interest in relation to a segment of the original content; and prompting the user for an additional input, the additional input to cause a further modification of the playback (Page 16, lines 7-9 and Page 25, lines 13-19).

Claim 66 incorporates the limitations of claim 51 and further includes providing a link to other content accessible across a distributed network (Page 3, lines 1-4 and lines 15-17).

Claim 55 incorporates the limitations of claim 51 and further includes playing a plurality of sequentially adjacent words wherein a speed of playback is adjusted responsive to a user input (Fig. 3, block 317 and Page 9, lines 5-18). Claims 56 and 57 incorporate the limitations of claim 55. Claim 56 further includes adjusting a pitch of audible playback in relation to the speed of playback to improve intelligibility of an audible word (Fig. 3, block 319 and Page 9, lines 5-18). Claim 57 further includes adjusting a time-spacing between audible words in the playback in relation to the speed of playback to improve recognition of the audible words (Fig. 3, block 321 and Page 9, lines 5-18). Claim 58 incorporates the limitations of claim 57 and further includes wherein the individual audible words between the time spaces have their original natural pitch and speech rate preserved (Page 9, lines 5-18).

Claim 62 incorporates the limitations of claim 51 and further includes providing additional content that includes an index of words spoken in a soundtrack of the original content (Page 7, lines 21-22); adjusting the speed of playback of the original content responsive to a user input; adjusting at least one of pitch and time-spacing of the words to improve at least one of intelligibility and recognition (Page 9, lines 5-18); and maintaining a correlation of words spoken to specific points in the content by reference to the index (Fig. 4, block 421, Page 18, lines 1-3, and Page 19, lines 17-23).

Claim 67 incorporates the limitations of claim 51 and further includes controlling access to at least one of content and functions based upon rights granted to the user. Claim 68 incorporates the limitations of claim 67 and further includes wherein rights are granted based on payments received (Page 5, lines 9-14).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

The issues involved in this Appeal are as follows:

- A. Are claims 51-54, 59-61, 63-66 and 89 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) for being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,632,094 issued to Falcon et al (“Falcon”)?
- B. Is claim 55 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being obvious over Falcon in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,882,202 issued to Sameth et al (“Sameth”)?
- C. Are claims 67 and 68 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being obvious over Falcon in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,302,695 issued to Rtischev et al (“Rtischev”)?
- D. Are claims 56-58 and 62 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being obvious over Falcon in view of Sameth and in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,794,203 issued to Kehoe (“Kehoe”)?

VII. ARGUMENT

The Examiner has rejected claims 51-54, 59-61, 63-66 and 89 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) over Falcon.

The Examiner has rejected claim 55 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Falcon in view of Sameth.

The Examiner has rejected claims 67 and 68 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Falcon in view of Rtishev.

The Examiner has rejected claims 67 and 68 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Falcon in view of Sameth and in view of Kehoe.

All of the claims do not stand or fall together. The basis for the separate patentability of the claims is set forth below.

A. Overview of the Prior Art

1. Overview of Falcon

Falcon teaches a method for simulating story reading by a human mentor to a child. Col. 3, lines 38-42. The method includes displaying a printed text with an image on a monitor to tell a story. Col. 5, lines 16-19. When a child actuates a first feature by clicking a button on the monitor, each successive word of the printed text is visually highlighted in synchronization with natural-voice narration of the text. A second feature allows the child to select individual words within the text to hear the pronunciation of the words. A third feature, actuated after the completion of the second feature, provides a contextual explanation of the selected word. Col. 5, lines 41-57. The contextual explanation tells the child only what he needs to know to understand the meaning of the word in the context of the sentence and story. Thus, the feature closely resembles a human mentor reading with a child. Col. 9, lines 29-39.

Falcon does not teach a system capable of observing activities of a user, inferring the extent of knowledge of a language of the user, or automatically adjusting the form of assistance to the

user. Moreover, the audio narration taught by Falcon is produced solely for the purpose of language learning.

2. Overview of Sameth

Sameth discloses a foreign language instruction program that displays selected frames of a story and dialogue balloons in a foreign language. Abstract. The program also displays translation of the phrases in the dialogue balloons and plays the speech associated with the phrases. Col. 2, lines 46-47. A control icon may be toggled between normal and slow speech to allow a user to better ascertain the content of the speech. Col. 6, lines 14-22.

Sameth also does not teach a system capable of presenting an original content originally produced for purposes other than language learning, observing activities of a user, inferring the extent of knowledge of a language of the user, or automatically adjusting the form of assistance to the user.

3. Overview of Rtishev

Rtishev teaches a language training system in which geographical diverse groups of learners, conversation partners, and teachers exchange asynchronous spoken message over a network. Col. 2, lines 44-49. The system maintains an account for a learner to store information about the learner. The account may include name, address, language fluency, payment information, and the like. Col. 9, lines 1-7. A copyright notice of Rtishev's disclosure states that a portion of the patent document contains materials subject to copyright protection. Col. 1, lines 15-21.

Rtishev also does not teach a system capable of presenting an original content originally produced for purposes other than language learning, observing activities of a user, inferring the extent of knowledge of a language of the user, or automatically adjusting the form of assistance to the user. Further, Rtishev does not teach a language training system where rights to contents are reserved to an inventor or originator of the content, or a user accesses content based upon logging into an account that requires a payment for maintenance of such an account.

4. Overview of Kehoe

Kehoe teaches a biofeedback system for speech disorders. The system detects disfluent speech and controls the auditory feedback according to the disfluent speech. An auditory feedback controller may shift the pitch of the user's voice, and automatically vary the user's speaking rate at regular time intervals. Abstract. The system allows the user to hear his own speech over the headphones with a delay of a fraction of a second. Col. 2, lines 19-20.

Kehoe also does not teach a system capable of presenting an original content originally produced for purposes other than language learning, inferring the extent of knowledge of a language of the user, or automatically adjusting the form of assistance to the user.

B. Rejection of Claims 51 and 89 Under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as Anticipated by Falcon

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). With respect to claim 51, Falcon fails to teach a method including at least the elements of “presenting an original content including at least one of video or audio content originally produced primarily for purposes other than language learning;” “observing an activity of the user,” “inferring the extent of knowledge of a language of the user,” and “automatically adjusting the form of assistance to the user.”

The Examiner asserts that Falcon’s system “mimics the language recognition ability of a human mentor, including inferring from user responses the understanding of language presented by the system.” Advisory Action. For the teaching of inferring, the Examiner relies on Falcon at col. 9, lines 29-39. Appellants respectfully submit that the cited passage teaches no more than that the provided word definitions can be understood by children and are contextually correct. The selection of words for general children at the developmental stage of the word definitions cannot possibly teach the claimed element of inferring which occurs at the presentation time. At the presentation time, there is no inference to be made as there is only

one possible choice (the definition selected to be contextually correct). Moreover, any inference, if at all, derived at the developmental stage necessarily generalizes the behavior and mental capacity of average children. Such generalization is patently distinct from the claimed inference drawn from a particular user who is being assisted and whose activities are being observed. Further, any inference if at all made at the developmental stage is made by people who are so far-removed from and tangential to other elements of the claimed method that the characterization of their inference as part of the claim is tenuous and far-fetched.

Further, Falcon does not teach automatically adjusting the form of assistance to the user. The Examiner asserts that Falcon teaches tracking the playback position of the playback for the user by recording playback position, position timing and ancillary data to “allow the user to automatically adjust the playback assistance to the user.” Final Office Action at page 2 section 3, second paragraph. Falcon at most teaches that a user may select different buttons to obtain different types of assistance. Thus, characterizing the adjustment made by a user as automatic is contrary to its common meaning as an automatic adjustment in the given context would not require a user’s physical or direct act. Thus, Appellants submit that the Examiner has failed to show that Falcon’s system is capable of automatically adjusting the form of assistance to the user.

Additionally, the Examiner has not shown where in Falcon’s disclosure that teaches the element of “observing an activity of a user.” Appellants have carefully reviewed the entire disclosure of Falcon but have been unable to identify any passage that supports the Examiner’s assertion. Falcon’s monitor does not make observation on user activities, but rather passively reacts to the click of buttons by a user. Passively reacting to a click of button does not teach the claimed element of observing.

Finally, Falcon does not teach the element of “an original content including at least one of video or audio content originally produced primarily for purposes other than language learning.” Falcon’s monitor displays text accompanied by image and narration, both of which are produced solely for the purpose of language learning. The displayed text also cannot

constitute the original content, at least for the reason that the text does not contain either video or audio content. Appellants note the Examiner relies on col. 3, lines 52-53 for this element. Appellants respectfully submit that the cited passage merely sets forth that text is displayed on a video screen, and an audio narration of the text is generated from stored audio data. It is difficult to discern how the text displayed on a video screen satisfies the limitation of an original content including at least one of video or audio content originally produced primarily for purposes other than language learning.

Analogous discussions apply to claim 89. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that claims 51 and 89 are patentable over Falcon and request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) be overturned.

C. Rejection of Claims 52, 54, and 63 Under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as Anticipated by Falcon

Claims 52, 54, and 63 depend from claim 51 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 51, these claims are not anticipated by Falcon. Moreover, with respect to claim 52, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner's reliance on col. 9, lines 42-67 for teaching text database of words present within the original content is misplaced. As an initial matter, this section relates to creation of a database of an audio signal of a text narration of a book overlaid on the text. This cannot constitute the original content as claimed, at least for the reason that the book does not include video or audio content. Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion in Falcon of delivering an original content with an additional content, wherein the additional content includes a text database of words present within the original content.

With respect to claims 54 and 63, the Examiner's rejection suffers from the same deficiencies as discussed above in connection with the absence of original content from Falcon. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that claims 52, 54, and 63 are separately patentable over Falcon and request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) be overturned.

D. Rejection of Claim 53 Under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as Anticipated by Falcon

Claim 53 depends from claim 51 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 51, this claim is not anticipated by Falcon. Moreover, with respect to claim 53, there is no disclosure of combining additional content from a separate digital medium with the original content as claimed. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner omits the limitation of “from a separate digital medium.” However, such omission is contrary to the law when analyzing a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that claim 53 is separately patentable over Falcon and request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) be overturned.

E. Rejection of Claims 59 Under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as Anticipated by Falcon

Claim 59 depends from claim 51 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 51, claim 59 is not anticipated by Falcon. Moreover, with regard to claim 59, Appellants respectfully submit that the notion of automatically pausing, much less the basis for such pause, is completely absent from the citation by the Examiner. The Examiner cites col. 5, lines 37-61. However, this passage merely discusses various soft buttons, which a user may actuate to influence the activity of display. The actuation of the soft buttons cannot constitute automatically pausing the content during the playback as it is not automatic where the user physically and directly causes the result. Further, there is no indication that the point and duration is based on the extent of knowledge of the user (the extent which was inferred in the claim from which claim 59 depends, i.e., claim 51). Thus, claim 59 is independently patentable over Falcon. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that claim 59 is separately patentable over Falcon and request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) be overturned.

F. Rejection of Claims 60 Under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as Anticipated by Falcon

Claim 60 depends from claim 51 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 51, claim 60 is not anticipated by

Falcon. Appellants submit that the rejection of claim 60 suffers from similar deficiencies as claim 59. Moreover, the additional element of claim 60 reciting automatically offering an additional content during a pause is also not taught or suggested by Falcon. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that claim 60 is separately patentable over Falcon and request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) be overturned.

G. Rejection of Claim 61 Under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as Anticipated by Falcon

Claim 61 depends from claim 51 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 51, this claim is not anticipated by Falcon. Moreover, with respect to claim 61, the Examiner relies on col. 11, lines 45-62. Appellants submit that the cited passage merely indicates that a child can get as little or as much help as he needs. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the system actually prompts the user to indicate that they desire more or less assistance. Failure to disclose the prompting element of claim 61 necessitates withdrawal of the rejection. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that claim 61 is separately patentable over Falcon and request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) be overturned.

H. Rejection of Claims 64 Under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as Anticipated by Falcon

Claim 64 depends from claim 51 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 51, claim 64 is not anticipated by Falcon. Moreover, the Examiner relies on col. 10, lines 10-38 in the rejection of claim 64. Appellants respectfully submit that the cited discussion of the creation of the database fails to teach or suggest the analysis that is claimed, or for that matter, the presenting of the information of interest prior to playing the segment. There simply is no presentation of any information prior to playing the segment in Falcon and the cited passage relates to creation, not playback, and is thus inapposite in rendering this rejection. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that claim 64 is separately patentable over Falcon and request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) be overturned.

I. Rejection of Claims 65 Under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as Anticipated by Falcon

Claim 65 depends from claim 51 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 51, claim 65 is not anticipated by Falcon. Moreover, as with other claims discussed above, the analyzing element and the prompting element recited in claim 65 are absent from the Falcon. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that claim 65 is separately patentable over Falcon and request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) be overturned.

J. Rejection of Claims 66 Under 35 U.S.C § 102(a) as Anticipated by Falcon

Claim 66 depends from claim 51 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 51, claim 66 is not anticipated by Falcon. Moreover, Falcon only mentions providing the disclosed product on a website, but does not explicitly teach the link as claimed that provides access to other content. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that claim 66 is separately patentable over Falcon and request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) be overturned.

K. Rejection of Claim 55 Under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as Obvious over Falcon in view of Sameth

To establish a *prima facie* case for obviousness it must be shown that the cited references teach or suggest each element of the claim. See In Re Reinhart, 189 U.S.P.Q. 143, 147 CCPA, 1976 ("*prima facie*' case of obviousness is established where the teachings from the prior art itself would appear to have suggested the claimed subject matter").

Claim 55 depends from claim 51 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 51, Falcon does not teach or suggest each of the elements of claim 55. Sameth does not cure the defect of Falcon, for at least the reason that Sameth does not teach or suggest the observing element, the inferring element, or the automatically adjusting element. The Examiner has not identified and Appellants have been unable to discern any portion of Sameth that teach or suggest at least these elements of claim

51 from which claim 55 depends. Sameth's system does not observe the user's activities. At most, Sameth's system displays or plays stored translation and pronunciation in response to user selection of control icons. Sameth's system also does not automatically adjust the form of assistance to the user but rather provides assistance according to the user's request.

Thus, Falcon in view of Sameth does not teach or suggest each of the elements of Claim 55. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that claim 55 is separately patentable over Falcon in view of Sameth and request the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be overturned.

L. Rejection of Claims 56, 57, 58, and 62 Under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as Obvious over Falcon in view of Sameth and in view of Kehoe

Claims 56, 57, 58 and 62 depend from claims 51 and 55 and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons above in regard to claims 51 and 55, Falcon in view of Sameth does not teach or suggest each of the elements of claims 56, 57, 58 and 62.

The Examiner relies on Kehoe to teach the additional elements recited in claims 56, 57, 58 and 62. However, Kehoe does not cure the defect of Falcon and Sameth, at least for the reason that Kehoe also fails to disclose or suggest each of the elements of claim 51 from which claims 56, 57, 58 and 62 depend. The Examiner has not identified and Appellants have been unable to discern any portion of Kehoe that teaches or suggests the elements of claim 51. In particular, Appellants note that the Kehoe's system is directed at improving language disfluency which is a type of speech disorder totally unrelated to the knowledge of a language. At least for that reason, Kehoe does not teach or suggest the notion of inferring the extent of knowledge of a language as claimed. Kehoe's system also does not automatically adjust the form of assistance to the user at least for the reason that built-in feedback circuits of the system pre-determine the form of assistance available to the user.

Further, each of the claims 56, 57, 58 and 62 recites the additional element of playback. Appellants note that the biofeedback taught by Kehoe only delays an ongoing speech by a fraction of a second to allow a user to hear an immediate feedback of his own speech. As there

is no recording of the speech, there cannot possibly be any playback. Thus, the concept of playback is entirely absent from Kehoe's disclosure.

Moreover, Appellants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine these references. Kehoe is directed to biofeedback system for speech disorders. An attempt to apply Kehoe, which modifies a recording of a user's voice, to modify the prerecorded voice or from a movie soundtrack severely over reads the teachings of Kehoe. Both Falcon and Sameth are directed to a language learning system in which presumably the speakers (those providing the dialogue/narrative content) do not have a disorder. Absent Appellants' identification of the issue that the recognition of the spoken word in the soundtrack may be improved by the time spacing and pitch adjusted as claimed, one would not have been motivated to look for such adjustments. Accordingly, this combination could only have been arrived at by hindsight. Hindsight is inappropriate where neither of the references suggest the desirability of the combination, as is the case here.

Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that claims 56, 57, 58 and 62 are separately patentable over Falcon in view of Sameth and in view of Kehoe and request the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be overturned.

M. Rejection of Claim 67 Under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as Obvious over Falcon in view of Rtishev

Claim 67 depends from claim 51 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons above in regard to claim 51, Falcon does not teach or suggest each of the elements of claim 67. Further, Rtishev fails to cure the deficiencies discussed above in connection with the claims from which claim 67 depends.

Moreover, contrary to Examiner's assertion, Rtishev does not teach that the content is subject to access based upon an assignment of rights reserved to an inventor or originator of said content. Final Office Action at page 6, section 5. The Examiner relies on col. 1, lines 15-21 for this teaching. However, the cited passage is a copyright notice of Rtishev's disclosure stating that a portion of the disclosure is subject to copyright protection. The copyright notice

is totally unrelated to the language training system taught by Rtischev, and thus cannot possibly teach or suggest the claimed element of controlling access to at least one of content and functions based upon rights granted to the user recited in claim 67. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that claim 67 is separately patentable over Falcon in view of Rtischev and request the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be overturned.

N. Rejection of Claim 68 Under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as Obvious over Falcon in view of Rtischev

Claim 68 depends from claim 51 and incorporates the limitations thereof. Thus, at least for the reasons above in regard to claim 51, Falcon does not teach or suggest each of the elements of claim 68. Again, Rtischev fails to cure the deficiencies discussed above in connection with the claims from which claim 68 depends.

Moreover, contrary to Examiner's assertion, Rtischev does not teach that a user accesses content based upon logging into an account that requires a payment for maintenance of such an account. Final Office Action at page 6, section 5. Appellants have been unable to discern any portion in Rtischev that discloses an account that requires a payment for maintenance of such an account as asserted by the Examiner. At most, Rtischev discloses that a user account may include payment information (Col. 9, lines 5-8). A mere passing reference to payment information does not teach the claimed payment-based rights. Thus, claims 67 and 68 are patentable for these additional reasons. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully submit that claim 68 is separately patentable over Falcon in view of Rtischev and request the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be overturned.

VIII. CONCLUSION AND RELIEF

Accordingly, it is submitted that the rejections of Claims 1, 3-7 and 10-22 based on 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103 be overturned.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Dated: July 19, 2005



Thomas M. Coester Reg. No. 39,637

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING:

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Virginia, VA 22313-1450, on July 19, 2005.



Nadya Gordon 7/19/05
Date

IX. CLAIMS APPENDIX

The claims involved in this Appeal are as follows:

1-50 (Canceled)

51. (Original) A method comprising:

presenting an original content including at least one of video or audio content originally produced primarily for purposes other than language learning;

providing assistance to a user to facilitate language learning;

observing an activity of the user;

inferring the extent of knowledge of a language of the user; and

automatically adjusting the form of assistance to the user.

52. (Original) The method of Claim 51 further comprising:

delivering the original content with an additional content via a same digital medium;

wherein the additional content includes a text database of the words present within the original content; and

wherein the additional content further includes information about the words.

53. (Original) The method of claim 51 further comprising:

combining an additional content from a separate digital medium with the original content;

wherein the additional content includes a text database of the words present within the original content; and

wherein the additional content further includes information about the words.

54. (Original) The method of claim 51 further comprising:

playing the original content associated with a plurality of sequentially adjacent words

wherein the length and starting point of the sequence of words is responsive to a user input.

55. (Original) The method of claim 51 further comprising:

playing a plurality of sequentially adjacent words wherein a speed of playback is adjusted responsive to a user input.

56. (Original) The method of claim 55 further comprising:

adjusting a pitch of audible playback in relation to the speed of playback to improve intelligibility of an audible word.

57. (Original) The method of claim 55 further comprising:

adjusting a time-spacing between audible words in the playback in relation to the speed of playback to improve recognition of the audible words.

58. (Original) The method of claim 57 wherein the individual audible words between the time spaces have their original natural pitch and speech rate preserved.

59. (Original) The method of 51 further comprising:
automatically pausing the content during playback at a point and for a duration based on the extent of the knowledge.

60. (Original) The method of 59, further comprising:
automatically offering an additional content during a pause based on the extent of the knowledge.

61. (Original) The method of 51, further comprising:
prompting the user to indicate if they desire more or less assistance.

62. (Original) The method of claim 51, further comprising:
providing additional content that includes an index of words spoken in a soundtrack of the original content;
adjusting the speed of playback of the original content responsive to a user input;
adjusting at least one of pitch and time-spacing of the words to improve at least one of intelligibility and recognition; and
maintaining a correlation of words spoken to specific points in the content by reference to the index.

63. (Original) The method of claim 51, further comprising:
providing additional content that includes an index of words spoken in the original content;
providing a library of audible pronunciations for a plurality of the words in the index; and
playing the pronunciations in response to a user input.

64. (Original) The method of claim 51 further comprising:
analyzing at least one of a user input, a context of the user input, a database of the original content, a database of an additional content, and a database of user information to identify information of interest in relation to a segment of the original content;
presenting the information of interest prior to playing the segment.

65. (Original) The method of claim 51 further comprising:
analyzing at least one of a user input, a context of the user input, a database of the original content, a database of an additional content, and a database of user information to identify information of interest in relation to a segment of the original content; and
prompting the user for an additional input, the additional input to cause a further modification of the playback.

66. (Original) The method of claim 51, further comprising:
providing a link to other content accessible across a distributed network.

67. (Original) The method of claim 51, further comprising:
controlling access to at least one of content and functions based upon rights granted to the user.

68. (Original) The method of claim 67, wherein rights are granted based on payments received.

69-88 (Canceled)

89. (Original) A machine readable medium, having stored therein a set of instructions, which when executed cause a machine to perform a set of operations comprising:
presenting an original content including at least one of video or audio content originally produced primarily for purposes other than language learning;
providing assistance to a user to facilitate language learning;
observing an activity of the user;
inferring the extent of knowledge of a language of the user; and
automatically adjusting the form of assistance to the user.

90-94 (Canceled).

X. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence is submitted with this appeal.

XI. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

No related proceedings exist.